

## REMARKS

Applicants note with appreciation that in the Office Action of August 15, 2008, the Examiner noted that claims 2-4, 8, 13, 16-23, 26, 33, 34 and 41-49 are allowed. Claim 37 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By the present amendment, claim 37 has been rewritten in independent form, and therefore is believed to now be in allowable form.

The Examiner rejected claims 14, 35, 36 and 39-40 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCallum (US 4,085,028 in view of Price, et al (US 2003/0213503).

Claim 38 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCallum (US 4,085,028) in view of Price, et al (US 2003/0213503) as applied above to claim 35, and further in view of Bentley (US 6,716,325).

By the present amendment, applicants have clarified claim 35, so that the invention defined by that claim is distinguishable over the references relied on by the Examiner. Specifically, claim 35 now defines an enclosure defining an operative area in the electrochemical cell device, with the metallic plated located within the enclosure defining the operative area. The inlet is specifically defined as being an inlet to the enclosure defining the operative area. The outlet is specifically defined as being an outlet from the enclosure. The storage device is specifically defined as being located in the enclosure defining the operative area, downstream of the inlet and upstream of the outlet.

This structural arrangement, now more clearly defined in claim 35, is not shown or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner. McCallum discloses an electrolysis cell 58 which is connected by a conduit to a mixer 57, which is, in turn, connected via two separate conduits 56 and 53 to a saturator 52 and a supply of water 50. Salt is introduced into the saturator 50, which is two structures away from the electrolysis cell. There is no teaching of

providing the saturator within an enclosure defining the electrolysis cell as claim 35 now specifically requires. The electrolysis cell 58 of McCallum includes an inlet, being the conduit leading to the mixer 57 and an outlet, being the conduit leading to the bottle. The storage space for receiving a supply of a salt composition is not located between the inlet and outlet of the electrolysis cell enclosure, as required by claim 35. The secondary reference, Price, is only used to disclose the use of a electrolytic cell in an automatic cleaning appliance, and is not used to disclose the presence or location of a salt storage space. Therefore, a combination of the teachings of Price with McCallum does not overcome the deficiencies of the teachings of McCallum, as noted above.

In view of the structural differences between the clarified claim language and the teachings of McCallum and Price, applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 35 and its dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the references relied on by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin W. Guynn/ (Reg. No. 29,927)  
Kevin W. Guynn  
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD  
**Customer Account No. 24978**  
300 S. Wacker Drive , Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6771  
Telephone (312) 987-2187  
Attorneys for Applicant